

**Remarks**

Claims 1-3 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimizu et al (US 6,171,437). Claims  
5 1-3 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Witcraft et al (US 5,280,894). Claims 4-13 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim.

1. Rejection of claims 1-3 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):  
10 Claims 1-3 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimizu et al (US 6,171,437) for reasons of record, as recited on pages 2-3 of the above-indicated Office action (part of paper no.1).

15 **Response:**

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Specifically, claim 1 has been merged with claims 2 and 4, and claims 2 and 4 have been canceled. No new matter is added by this amendment to claim 1. Claim 4 was objected  
20 to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was otherwise deemed allowable if rewritten in appropriate independent form. Reconsideration of the currently amended claim 1 is hereby requested. Likewise, since claims 3 and 14-17 are all dependent on the currently amended claim 1,  
25 claims 3 and 14-17 should be allowed if the amended claim 1 is allowed.

2. Rejection of claims 1-3 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):  
30 Claims 1-3 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Witcraft et al (US 5,280,894) for reasons of record, as recited on pages 3-4 of the above-indicated Office action (part of paper no.1).

**Response:**

As stated above, claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Claims 3 and 14-17 are all dependent on the currently amended claim 1. Reconsideration of claims 1, 3, and 14-17 is politely requested.

**3. Amendments to claims 3, 5, and 6:**

Claims 3, 5, and 6 are currently amended to depend upon non-canceled base claims. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Reconsideration of claims 3, 5, and 6 is therefore politely requested.

**4. Introduction to new claims 18-26:**

Claim 18 is written to include the limitations of claims 1, 2, and 7. Claim 7 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was otherwise deemed allowable if rewritten in appropriate independent form. Claims 19-21 are duplicates of original claims 8-10, respectively.

Claim 22 is written to include the limitations of claims 1 and 11. Claim 11 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was otherwise deemed allowable if rewritten in appropriate independent form. Claims 23-24 are duplicates of original claims 12-13, respectively.

In addition, claims 25 and 26 are each duplicates of original claim 15, and are written to depend on new independent claims 18 and 22, respectively. No new matter is introduced in any of these new claims. Consideration of claims 18-26 is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

5 Winston Hsu Date: 11/18/2003

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No.41,526

P.O. BOX 506

Merrifield, VA 22116

U.S.A.

10 e-mail: winstonhsu@naipo.com.tw